# REMARKS

Claims 17, 20, 26, 28, 30 and 34 have been amended. Claims 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, and 32 have been canceled. New claims 37-44 have been added. Thus, claims 17-18, 20, 26-28, 30, 31, 33-44 are currently pending and presented for examination. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Rejections Under Section 103:

Claims 17, 19-30 and 32-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being obvious over Reichmeyer et al. (USPN 6,286,038) in view of Choudhry (USPN 6,442,602). Claims 18 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being obvious over Reichmeyer in view of Choudhry and Skemer et al. (USPN 6,570,849)

Applicant's Claim 17 recites:

> storing a <u>domain name of the device in the device</u>, the domain
> name input manually on the device by an administrator

For this limitation the Examiner states "(DHCP client, 10 in figure 1 or Network device, 61 in figure 8) (Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (DHCP) assigns dynamic Internet Protocol address to devices on a network, see, e.g., col 3, lines 62-65)". Furthermore, the Examiner states that "a domain name is defined as an address of a computer network connection and identifies the owner of the address, see, e.g., The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language Fourth Edition 2000)". Thus, the Examiner apparently equates the Internet Protocol address assigned via the DHCP as a domain name.

However, the American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language Fourth Edition 2000 defines a domain name as a <u>series of alphanumeric strings separated by periods, such as</u> *www.hmco.com*, that is an address of a computer network connection and that identifies the owner of the address (see. e.g. paragraph [0005]). The following is a quotation from MPEP 2111.01

> This means that the words of the claim must be given their plain meaning
> unless **>the plain meaning is inconsistent with< the specification.
> ...[T]he ordinary and customary meaning of a claim term is the
> meaning that the term would have to a person of ordinary skill in
> the art in question at the time of the invention, *i.e.*, as of the
> effective filing date of the patent application.

In contrast, an Internet Protocol (IP) address is <u>numeric</u> address with a fixed length of 32 bits (see e.g. IETF standard 791 for IP version 4 (IPv4)) or a fixed length of 128 bits ( see e.g., IETF standard 2373 for IP version 6 (Ipv6)). A string value cannot reasonably considered a numeric value. Likewise, a domain name would not reasonably be considered an IP address. Furthermore Applicant's Claim 17 recites:

> transmitting a request message comprising the stored domain name to an addressing server by the device, wherein the addressing server is used to convert between domain names and Internet protocol addresses and to <u>look up address information of a parameter server based on the transmitted domain name</u>

For this limitation the Examiner equates the request message to a DHCP request (18 in figure 1), the DHCP request comprising the stored domain name (server identification or network IP address). In the previous limitation the Examiner equated the domain name to the dynamically assigned IP address of the device. However, apparently for this limitation the Examiner now considers the domain name to be the server identification or network IP address. As presented above, an IP address cannot reasonably considered as a domain name. Furthermore, the DNS server identifier in the DHCP request message is used to identify the DNS server selected (see e.g., col. 4 lines 14-17) and not to <u>look up address information of a parameter server</u>. Moreover, the server identifier is associated with the selected server and not associated with the device. The following is a quotation from MPEP 2143

> To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) *must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.*

In view of the above, claim 17 is not obvious over Reichmeyer in view of Choudhry. Furthermore, Claims 18-20, and 24-25 which depend on claim 17 are also patentable at least based on their dependence from claim 17 as well as based on their own merits. For at least the reasons discussed for claim 17, independent claims 26 and 30 are also patentable. As well as their dependent claims 27, 28 and 31-36. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Section 103 rejections.

Response to Provisional Double Patenting Rejection:

Claims 17, 26 and 30 stand provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as "claiming the same invention as that of claim 23 and 27 of co-pending application No 10/884,485". As noted above a domain name is not an IP address. Furthermore, Claims 17, 26 and 30 of instant application claim storing a domain name whereas claims 23 and 27 of co-pending application claim storing a predetermined address. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Provisional Double Patenting rejections.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the objections and rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including fees for additional claims and terminal disclaimer fee, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11-29-2007

By: _____

Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830